

### REMARKS

Claims 24-31 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

### Interview

Applicants thank the examiner and his SPE for granting a telephonic interview held on 23 April 2008. During the interview, Hashimoto (JP 11-174910) and Boyce (USP 6,873,425) in relation to the claimed invention were discussed. The examiner tentatively agreed that claim 28 defines over these references because they do not disclose or teach displaying items that do not require maintenance. The examiner, however, indicated that a further search may be needed before it can be deemed allowable.

Moreover, the examiner tentatively agreed that if we define the “adjustment” in independent claim 24 as a “mechanical adjustment, it will define over these references. In this respect, the examiner indicated that he will obtain a better translation of Hashimoto (JP 11-174910) to determine what “adjustment” this reference discloses.

The examiner also confirmed that claims 25-27, 29, and 31 will be allowed if they are placed in independent form. Note that the paragraph indicating their allowability was inadvertently omitted.

### Amendment

In light of the interview, claim 24 has been amended to clarify that the “adjustment” refers to a mechanical adjustment, and allowable claims 25-27 have been placed in independent form. But as independent claim 28 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 29 and 31 have been maintained in their dependent form. No new matter has been introduced.

### Art Rejection

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hashimoto. Claims 28 and 30 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Boyce.

For the reasons explained above, independent claim 28 defines over Boyce because Boyce does not disclose or teach displaying items that do not require maintenance.

As for independent claim 24, applicants submit that Hashimoto does not disclose or teach making any mechanical adjustment. In this respect, Hashimoto would not have disclosed or taught the claimed adjustment item-detecting device, adjustment item-selecting device, and adjustment executing device set forth in claim 24.

During the interview, the examiner's SPE has noted that Hashimoto discloses adjusting the cover of a copier, which is deemed a mechanical adjustment. The undersigned explained during the interview that, as best understood from the machine translation, Hashimoto discloses selecting the cover "sheet" mode, and not a mechanical adjustment for the copier cover. Indeed, applicants submit that Hashimoto merely discloses notifying the user with an LED, that the cover "printing" is not permissible. Applicants submit that Hashimoto does not disclose or teach any items of mechanical adjustment for its image forming apparatus, let alone as set forth in claim 24.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 24-31 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

26 MAY 2008

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 052608/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)